

THE BEST FRIEND
A STUDY IN THE FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

2 7-
36

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

BY
MILDRED LEE BRUMMELL

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

AUGUST, 1948

R. H. T. 66

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express her sincere thanks and appreciation to all those who assisted in this study. In particular does she wish to thank, Drs. Ira De A. Reid, Mozell C. Hill, for their advice, assistance and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem	1
Hypothesis	2
Definitions	4
Theories on the Nature of Friendship	5
The Best Friend	10
Methodology and Techniques of this Study	13
II. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FRIENDSHIP POPULATION . . .	16
General Factors	17
III. THE SELF - A COMPOSITE TYPE	23
Characteristics of Self as Revealed by Analysis	23
IV. THE BEST FRIEND	29
Characteristics as Revealed by Analysis:	
Female-Female	30
Male-Male	31
Female-Male	33
Male-Female	34
V. THE FRIENDSHIP STRUCTURE	38
Characteristics as Revealed by Analysis:	
Female-Female	38
Female-Male	39
Male-Male	39
Male-Female	40
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	43
APPENDIX	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is a truism that if a well-rounded concept of a society is to be attained, two aspects of its social organization must be considered, the one based on blood relationships, the other on that of free association.¹ The most fundamental and immediate of these groupings is one most neglected by sociologists and anthropologists--friendship. Friendship, one of the basic social relations found among man, apparently has been accepted by the scholars as a common phenomenon found in all societies with little need of explanation.

Early attempts were made by psychologists to explain friendship in connection with group formation and activities, and in terms of the gregarious instinct. According to these theorists, humans, like many other higher animals, have an inherited disposition to prefer associations with other members of their own kind. This instinct, it was claimed, found expression in the group activities common to man the world over. Societies, tribes, secret orders are all the result of man's desire to be with his fellow, thereby satisfying this inborn urge. Thomas' and Znaniecki's² fundamental wishes, Tonnies'³ concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, Giddings,⁴

¹Melville J. Herskovits, "The Best Friend in Dahomey," Negro Anthropology, ed. Nancy Cunard (London, 1934), p. 627.

²Thomas, W. I. and Znaniecki, F., The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (New York, 1927), p. 232.

³Ferdinand Tonnies, Fundamental Concepts of Sociology, translated by Charles R. Loomies (New York, 1940), p. 12. F. Tonnies in his sociological system set up the concepts or ideal types Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft as natural and rational will.

⁴Theodore Abel, "The Significance of the Concept of Consciousness of Kind," Social Forces, IX (October, 1930), p. 3.

"Consciousness of Kind" concept, and many other concepts have been used in an attempt to explain the friendship constellation, yet little theory has developed on friendship as a basis relationship in society.

For this reason the writer undertook a pilot study of the "best friend" pattern as found among college students with the hopes of gaining further insight into the nature of the friendship structure as it reflected in the social attributes of the person described as one's best friend. It is the assumption of this study that friendship stresses likeness between friends, that people select as friends other people whom they resemble in one or more characteristics. Bernice L. Neugarten's article "Social Class and Friendship among School Children"¹ and Mapheus Smith's article "Some Factors in Friendship Selection of High School Students,"² were used as referral points in previous studies.

Neugarten's study was conducted in a Middle Western community composed of approximately ninety per cent native-born whites. There were no Negroes or Orientals and but two distinguishable ethnic groups--a small Polish group and a somewhat larger group of Norwegians in this community. For the purpose of her study, the people of the community were divided into five groups--upper class, professional men, small business men, lower income group, semi-skilled and laborers, and lower-lower class persons. This analysis followed the W. L. Warner caste-class hypothesis of the American society.³ Neugarten's study was concerned with the question to what extent

¹ Bernice L. Neugarten, "Social Class and Friendship among School Children," American Journal of Sociology, LI (January, 1946), p. 305.

² Mapheus Smith, "Friendship Selection of High School Students," Sociometry, VII (August, 1944), p. 303.

³ William L. Warner, Social Life of a Modern Community (New Haven, 1945), p. 213.

and in what observable way does the factor of social status affect the social development of children? Specifically, the investigation raised the question: "is the social class position of the family a contributing factor in determining a child's choice of friends or the child's reputation among his age-mates"? The concluding hypotheses presented by Miss Neugarten were: "that (1) children tend to select as friends, children of higher status than their own and secondly of their own status level; and (2) "that a high degree of relationship was noted between the family's social position and the friendship status of the child. This did not occur in the friendship structures among lower-class children.

Mapheus Smith in his study in Abilene, Kansas¹ set up two categories for his study of friendship--an "in-category" and an "out-category." "In-category" subjects selected as friends those having the same characteristics, "out-category" persons selected as friends those having different characteristics from their own. Smith found in his study that "in-category" choices in friendship selection. As a general principle Smith suggested that friendship choices are somewhat egocentric, or more properly egomorphic in character, that is to say, of such a nature that the person selected, to some extent at least, reflects the character or form of the selector. In turn this may mean that friendship selection is merely a form of ego-expansion, of adding to one's ego by extending its limits to embrace other people having the same general characteristics.

The conclusion concerning the self reflective nature of the friendship selection raises a question which can only be answered by further research.

¹Op. cit., p. 303.

Smith was desirous of learning whether the similarity between the persons who designate friends and those whom they designate developed as a result of association which changed the characteristics of the participants, or, whether the selection grew out of recognition of characteristics already in existence before the association began. These questions, Smith maintained, needed further research if they were to be answered.

In this study and for purposes of analysis of the best-friend, it is requisite that the concept be defined. Several definitions will follow. Friendship has been defined in the Oxford English Dictionary¹ as "the relationship between those of the same rank, of equals, consisting of two, who act together and who are connected by some common principle or mutual benevolence; common bond." The Century Dictionary² defines friendship as, "one who is attached to another by feelings of personal regard and preference; one who entertains for another sentiments which lead him to seek his company and to study to promote his welfare." Friendship has been defined also as feelings of consideration and regard for another's feelings, wishes, opinions, possessions, beliefs, confidence and admiration for another's qualities, accomplishments, characteristics and personality."³ Moreover, it may be thought of as the "one and one" group, as the simplest unit of social interaction; of two individuals in one or more relations. Such a relationship has the elements of both an inward and an outward pull,

¹ G. C. T. Onions (ed.), Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford, 1936), 2nd edition, 1, p. 75.

² Benjamin E. Smith (ed.), Century Dictionary (New York, 1910), 1, p. 498.

³ Della T. Lute, "Losing Friends and Being Influenced," Forum, XCVIII (November, 1937), p. 262.

which is to say that there are attitudes of both cohesion and opposition within any dyadic relationship of mutual influencing.¹ In this study, the best-friend will be employed as a relationship between two individuals, who have complete confidence in each other, share similar interests; as an intimate association between two individuals with an equalitarian basis. It is the "one and one" group out of which arises such types of social relations as the pal, buddy, companion, boy friend, girl friend, courtship, and, eventually, marriage. Several concepts are employed in interpreting "one and one" relationships, chief among them being, homogany and dyadic.

Sociologists recognize three bases of classification of social interaction:² (1) in terms of the number of persons involved, (2) on the basis of degree of intimacy, and (3) by social processes. Of the first form of social interaction there are three types: one-with-one; one-with-group and its reverse, group-with-one; and group-with group. Social interaction is a two-way process whereby each individual or group stimulates the other, and, in varying degrees, modifies the behavior of the participants. It is the result of social contact, the primary requirement for all social interaction.

The contacts into which individuals enter in the course of their activities and which lead to some form of adjustment, are of three distinct types.³ Some contacts are ephemeral, quickly coming and passing in the daily routine of life. This is the case particularly with so-called secondary contacts or, with those contacts which become more or less permanent, a

¹ William L. Warner, op. cit., p. 73.

² Francis J. Brown, Educational Sociology (New York, 1947), p. 139.

³ Theodore Abel, op. cit., p. 4.

permanency not necessarily determined by the individual's choice, but one that may be by social tradition or circumstances. Such are the relations to the government, to members of traditional groups, to those who are in pursuit of similar interests. Finally, there are contacts with regard to which the individual exercises a selective function, where he chooses the persons with whom he wants to interact. He may select from among those with whom he is forced to establish contacts and go beyond the traditional and circumstantial. Or he may drift into or set out deliberately to enter into contacts that will terminate in desired relations.¹

Selection is a specific aspect of the general scheme of human action, determined first by the particular tendencies, purposes and interests of the acting individual or group, and secondly, by the reactions of those who are the objects of actions. Consideration of the reaction of others may refer to past experiences and thus imply anticipation of reaction, in short may be based upon pre-existing attitudes with regard to others, or it may refer to actual reactions whereby attitudes are formed in the course of interaction.² Interests and expected or actual reactions of others therefore are at the basis of selection.

In the friendship selections made by an individual there are two types of choices he may make: (1) instrumental choice, and (2) qualitative choice. In instrumental choice the individual may select as a question of policy those who, in some way, will contribute through the resources in their possession, to the realization of his dominant tendency, purpose or interest. In qualitative choice the individual is subjected to situations that are due to

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

the traits of personality which the "other" possesses. In exercising his choice in establishing contacts, the individual will define the "other", therefore, also with regard to the psychological and social types which he represents.¹ The three typical variants of discrimination which we distinguished, personality, group-membership and social status constitute this second principle of selection. It is in qualitative choice that Giddings' "Consciousness of Kind" concept plays a dominant role.

While social relations have not yet been adequately analyzed and classified, a provisional distinction is proposed between two fundamentally different types of relations. There are, first, relations that are ends in themselves in which intercourse is the self-sufficing purpose, and secondly, relations that serve as means for the realization of individual purposes.² The first type of relations, those that are ends in themselves, comprises the great number of contacts in which satisfaction of the desire for response is the main purpose. They are based upon intimacy, mutual attachment, and sympathy. Sentiment here takes the place of calculation. To this type belong such relations as are established in intercourse for sociability, in acquaintance, friendship, love and between members of face to face groups.

Ferdinand Tonnies states that all social relationships are created by human will of two types, natural and rational.³ As social facts they exist only through the will of the individual to associate this will and inner relationship of the associated individuals with one another.⁴ For instance,

¹ Ibid., p. 5.

² Ibid.

³ Op. cit., p. 14.

⁴ Ibid., p. 15.

a group or a relationship can be willed because those involved wish to attain through it a definite end and are willing to join hands for this purpose, even though indifference or even antipathy may exist on other levels. In this case rational will in which means and ends have been sharply differentiated prevails.¹ On the other hand, people may associate themselves together, as friends, because they think the relation valuable as an end in and of itself. In this connection, it is the "natural or integral will" which predominates. "Natural will" is the conditioning and originating element in any process of willing which is derived from the temperament, character, and intellectual attitude of the individual, whether it has its origin in liking, inclination, habit or memory.² It cannot be inferred, however, that natural will is always irrational. There are degrees of rationality of natural will and of the communities and groups which it forms. Thus, in order of the importance of rationality there are the Gemeinschaft groups based on friendships, on neighborliness, and on blood relationships.³

In discussing Gemeinschaft-like relationships, Tonnies used what he calls the fellowship type. The simplest fellowship type is represented by a pair who live together in a brotherly, comradely and friendly manner, a relationship that is likely to exist when those involved are of the same age, sex, and sentiment, are engaged in the same activity or have the same intentions, or when they are united by one idea.⁴

In legend and history such pairs occur frequently. The Greeks used to honor such friendships as those of Achilles and Patrochus, Orestes and

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 16.

⁴Ibid., p. 21.

Pylades, Epaminondas and Pelopidas, to the extent that to Aristotle is ascribed the paradox: He who has friends has no friends.

Tonnies says, friendship is independent of kinship and neighborhood, being conditioned by and resulting from similarity of work and intellectual attitude. It comes most easily into existence when callings or crafts are the same or of similar character. The relations between human beings themselves as friends and comrades have the least organic and intrinsically necessary character. They are the least instinctive and they are based less upon habit. They are of a mental nature and seem to be founded upon chance or free choice.¹

Georg Simmel holds that friendship is founded entirely upon a high degree of individualization between two participants. It is a combination of two in which there is no majority which can override the individual and that occasion for such a majority is given so soon as a single unit is added. Simmel places the friendship constellation in the realm of dominance and subordination. He states that relationships in which the domination of an individual by a majority is possible not merely depress the individuality, but so far as they are voluntary, they will not be readily entered upon by very decided individualities.² For friendship is a relationship entirely founded upon the individuality of the elements, which through its traditional forms, its social fixities, its real interests, includes much that is super-individual and independent of the peculiarity of the personalities. To Simmel, friendship rests upon a purely personal differentiation, hence

¹Op. cit., p. 49.

²Georg Simmel, "The Number of Members as Determining the Sociological Forms of the Group," The American Journal of Sociology, VIII (July, 1902), 159.

it is intelligible that, in general, real and permanent friendships are rare at the inferior levels of personal development.¹

In Dahomey, according to Herskovits,² tradition dictates that every person must have a best friend. In spite of the institutionalized structure that surrounds the best friend, those who stand in this relationship to one another are friends not alone in the European sense of the term, but enjoy a relationship of confidence and mutual esteem which is the closer because their friendship follows the ideal of what traditionally a best friend should mean.

The Dahomean idea assumes complete confidence between friends. It entails lack of reservation in the recounting of a man's actions and beliefs, and makes for an association where a person may speak his mind without equivocation.³ A best friend is the one with whom one may discuss his problems with the certainty that there will be no ulterior motivation in the answers of his friend, where he may share his dreams without fear of ridicule or indignity.⁴ This is not to say the Dahomean friendships attain this ideal, it would not be a human institution were this true. Yet the fact remains that for the Dahomean, man or woman, the ties which bind him to his best friend are as enduring and as respected as any he knows. When these ties are strained in instances where one has failed to fulfil the obligations of the best friend, his confidence in the institutionalized relationship of friendship is not disturbed, nor is there any lessening of the intensity of the emotion with which he contemplates the person to whom, in his

¹Ibid.

²Melville J. Herskovits, op.cit., p. 628.

³Ibid., p. 629.

⁴Ibid.

own life, he stands in this relationship.

In the institutionalized form of friendship in Dahomey, there is not one friend but there are three friends, though only the possession of a best friend is mandatory.¹

The first, the best friend, is preeminently the one to whom reference has been made, but, in addition to him there is a friend, "the one who stands against the wall" and a third friend known as "the friend on the threshold."²

These titles derive from the duties which the three must perform at the funeral of their friend, and these duties follow the role each plays in the life of the person. The best friend is the person to whom a man tells all, and, about whom he knows all there is to know. The "one who stands against the wall" (the second friend) is spoken to with some reserve, and to him is told only half of what a man knows. The third friend, the one "on the threshold" must keep his distance, and learn only so much as he can hear.

Friendships are generally formed at an early age, although it does occur that a young man of nineteen or twenty years has yet to find a best friend. In a large measure the close friendships that are to become of the institutional type arise out of the playmate relationship of childhood. Often incipient friendships are encouraged by the parents of two boys or two girls, since a Dahomean may never have a best friend of the opposite sex, the children are brought together by all manner of indication. Friendship often has its roots in the experiences of adolescence.

¹Ibid., p. 629.

²Ibid.

During a man's lifetime, everything about himself is told his best friend. This includes an account of his possessions, together with detailed information concerning the nature of what he owns, and in the case of money, where it is concealed and which of his sons he desires to be his heir. When a situation arises in which a man or a woman is in need of aid, or of advice, or of someone to whom he must unburden his mind, it is this friend who is sought out, for the best friend can always be counted on to help in time of need.

Friendship, which forms such an important part of the Dahomean culture takes a completely different function in Manus.¹ The whole life of the Manus adult, his most intimate relation to people, all fall under the head of exchange and trade. The Manus has no best friend. Friends are those people with whom one trades, or who helps one in trade. Among adults casual friendliness, neighborly visiting, is regarded as almost reprehensible. Manus men, uninterested in friendship themselves, are intolerant of friendship on the part of their wives. Friendship exists only among children in Manus. Friends are formed as play pairs. They are formed out of the early play groups of children and are resolved at early adolescence. Play pairs are found often where one child is aggressive and one passive. The differences in social personality are much more pronounced than other differences, of skill or intelligence, and it is possible for the aggressive children to gratify their urge for leadership most simply if they select another child of a different temperament. Alliances between two aggressive children are much less frequent. Sometimes two meek, passive

¹ Margaret Mead, Growing Up in New Guinea, in Margaret Mead, From the South Seas (New York, 1937), p. 81.

children will drift into an association, but these associations are less firm, fall apart quickly at the word of one of the more aggressive children.¹

Thus we see two completely different pictures of the functions of friendship in these societies. In Dahomey, it is impossible for a person, to live in the culture without a best friend. The mores and traditions demand that one have a best friend to carry out the various duties that must be performed. In Manus, friendship is of a mercenary nature. The friend is the one with whom one trades, but there is no mutual bond or exchange of confidence; feelings of mistrust and suspicion predominate.

In western culture the friendship structure has received little theoretical attention, yet it is the writer's belief that it possesses characteristics of both Dahomey and the Manus pattern--the close intimate association found in Dahomey and the mercenary characteristics of Manus.

The writer has sought to explore the friendship constellation because there has been a dearth of research in this particular area. Realizing, too, that the best friend relation is one of the basic relationships of most societies, and that further understanding of it is essential for the development of sociological theory.

The study of best friend patterns was conducted through questionnaires administered to one-hundred one persons selected from the student body of Spelman College, Clark College and Atlanta University. An effort was made to administer half of the questionnaires to males and the other half to females.

The basic questionnaire form used was constructed by Eugene Hartley,

¹Margaret Mead, op. cit., p. 143.

City College of New York for a study of inter-personal relations among Jewish students.¹ It was set up to study the relationship between the physical and social traits of an individual and his best friend.

Thirty-six questions were included on the original questionnaire. For this study, item (37), on race and color ratings were added in order to determine whether there was any significant difference of race consciousness in relation to color, sex, and place of birth or residence.

The thirty-seven questions were classified into five categories: (1) the socio-physical self; (2) self-esteem; (3) cultural conditioning of self; (4) social self; and (5) social self as related to the best friend, and the social self as related to things.

The questionnaire was constructed on a nine point scale which assigned high and low values to each trait. On the scale the mid-value five (5) was considered the average trait for an individual, one (1) and nine (9) were given high and low values respectively.

Through the questionnaire the researcher attempted to determine whether there was a significant correlation between the chronological age of the individual and the best friend. Whether the best friend reflects the same general characteristics as found in the individual as set forth in Smith's thesis;² and, finally the significance of color for the group being studied.

Through the construction of tables and the tabulation of scores, an analysis was made of those characteristics that had high and low scores for the best friend, for self and for the friendship structure. The friendship population was divided into four groups: the female-female relationship;

¹See Appendix B.

²Op. cit., p. 305.

female-male relationship; male-male relationship; and male-female relationship. Each group was studied for the thirty seven values, comparison and contrast being made between each of the four groups and the total friendship population.

The questionnaires were filled in by the students during their regular class periods. Instructions were read with the admonishment not to fall into the error of rating the best friend high on all traits because he was considered high on some. This warning was given to assure the researcher that the tendency to idealize the best friend would be reduced to a minimum. The students were assured all results would be confidential and used for research purposes only.

CHAPTER II

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FRIENDSHIP POPULATION

The friendship population studied, composed as it was of college and university students may be considered a select friendship group. The writer sought to discover the nature of friendship formations on a college campus and those factors that influenced an individual in making his selection of a best friend.

A representative cross-section of the student body was obtained, as the 101 students, 56 females and 45 males, came from all sections and from all economic and social strata. Of the friendship population 40 per cent came from the same city, 23 per cent from southern states. This seems to indicate that some of the friendships were formed before the students entered college. According to the Alba Edwards classification of occupational classes,¹ the occupation of the father was of little significance as a deciding factor in the selection of a best friend. This fact may be explained by the tendency of college students to select best friends by physical appearance and achievements on a campus rather than in terms of the occupation of the father. It may also be the result of the selective factor that comprises a college group. An individual may assume that a best friend obtained in a college relationship is potentially, at least, a professional person.

The mean age of the group was 22.48 years; the median age 21.96 years. A correlation of .65 for the age factor supports the theories of Mapheus

¹Alba M. Edwards, "A Social Economic Groupings of the Gainful Workers of the United States," Journal of American Statistical Association XXVIII (December, 1933), pp. 377-386.

Smith¹ and Bernice Neugarten² who concluded that an individual tends to select a best friend of the same chronological age. The best friend in this study was the same age or several years younger or older; in only a few instances was the best friend a number of years older.

In the sex distribution of the friendship population persons tended to select a best friend of the same sex. The male-male friendships comprised 31 per cent of the population, female-female friendship, 35 per cent of the population. Female-female friendships were in a greater proportion than male-female, 21 per cent of the population was female-male and 14 per cent male-male friendships. This indicates that females are more inclined to select a best friend of the opposite sex than are males. Though no definitive explanation can be given for this tendency, tentatively it may be attributed to the fact that females tend to consider the "boy-friend" as the best friend, while males are more inclined to designate a male as the best friend. Courtship, engagements and marriages may account for the crossing of the sex lines for a best friend, as many later marriages are the result of friendships between the sexes formed during the college period.

The sex pattern of friendship, however, follows to some extent the intra-sexual best friend pattern in Dahomey.³

The best friend in Dahomey is never the opposite sex, custom and tradition demanding that he be of the same sex. In the United States the culture has not instituted the idea of the best friend of the same sex as in Dahomey.

The marital status of the friendship population was predominantly a

¹Op. cit., p. 303.

²Op. cit., p. 305.

³Melville J. Herskovits, op. cit., p. 627.

single one, 82 per cent of the population being single and having single best friends, and 6 per cent married with married best friends. The single persons selecting married best friends comprised 6 per cent of the population, married persons with single best friends, 3 per cent of the population. Single males and females in selecting a friend of the opposite sex tend to choose one of the same marital status, 90 per cent of the single females choose single males as best friends and 85 per cent of the males choose single females as best friends.

Single males have a higher percentage of married male best friends (16 per cent) in the male-male category than do single females. The single females having married female best friends constitute only 11 per cent of the friendship population of the female-female category. The absence of a common interest and close contact may account for single persons not selecting married persons as their best friends. On the other hand, on a college campus the married student usually takes residence in a private home thereby reducing contact with the other students. Married persons tend to form friendship among other married students.

The color factor in this study was of primary interest since we sought to discover if color was a determining factor in the selection of a best friend.

That color among Negroes is a very important factor in determining the economic and social status, one can attain in Negro society is evident through an examination of the Negro Youth Study¹ series recently published

¹The following volumes resulted from this study: Allison Davis and John Dollard, Children of Bondage (Washington, 1940); (2) E. Franklin Frazier, Negro Youth at the Crossways (Washington, 1940); (3) Charles S. Johnson, Growing Up in the Black Belt (Washington, 1940); (4) W. L. Warner, (et.al.) Color and Human Nature (Washington, 1941); (5) R. L. Sutherland, Color, Class and Personality (Washington, 1942); (6) Ira De A. Reid, In A Minor Key (Washington, 1940).

in this connection.

Johnson¹ in his discussion of color and social status, states that:

The color complex among Negroes grew out of the slave system. Mixed bloods which originated during slave days and produced the mulatto, who hold a more favorable position than the black Negro provided the basis for the color factor among Negroes. On one side the mulattoes were often the offspring of wealthy slave owners, or other persons of consequence in the society. They were the first to get the benefit of the schools and they shared, to some extent the prestige of their masters and progenitors. Occasionally they inherited bits of property, were granted freedom, or were permitted to purchase it. On the whole their lot was easier than that of their darker plantation kin.

Along with the advantageous social position of the mulatto there has been a pronounced disadvantage for blacks in the ideological heritage of society generally. The concept of blackness has held, in the popular mind, an unfavorable connotation. "Black is evil," "black as sin," "black as the devil," are phrases which suggest the emotional and aesthetic implications of this association.

The evil and ugliness of blackness have long been contrasted in popular thinking with the goodness and purity of whiteness. Whether with respect to men or things, this color association has been deeply meaningful; it is an inescapable element of the cultural heritage.

Warner in his study,² giving special attention to the color factor in Negro boys' and girls' conceptions of themselves and in their regard for each other, went so far as to comment that:

Color is possibly the most important single element that, "for better and for worse," determines the development of Negro character.

Other writers do not stress the point to this extent, but they all report color prejudice or color preference within Negro society and also acknowledge the preference which the white world often shows the individual

¹Charles S. Johnson, Growing Up in the Black Belt (Washington, D.C., 1941), pp. 256-57.

²W. Lloyd Warner, Color and Human Nature (Washington, D.C., 1941), pp. 23-25.

who is less Negroid in appearance.

To be brown-skinned is considered the most advantageous color among Negroes. A brown-skinned Negro can be "all things to all men," shifting back and forth between the light-skinned groups and the dark-skinned groups. He can "affiliate with lighter people of higher status--or he can be a race leader with darker people of high caste." His lot appears to be the happiest in the Negro society.¹ Warner found in his study² that a woman of high social standing had the greatest difficulty in coping with the problem of black pigmentation, which is another way of saying that high social standing and blackness are incompatible.

The color factor was not found to be so important in the case of men. If a dark-skinned man has compensatory qualities of exceptional ambition, intellectual ability, educational achievement, business success and family background he can get along well even in purely social matters and his dark color will be no great handicap.³ There have been many Negro marriages in which dark but economically successful men have married light-skinned wives, but seldom does a black Negro woman wed a light-colored, Caucasian-featured Negro male.

These studies were cited to give some insight into the importance of color among Negroes in the formation of their friendships associations, in marriage, and in the total social structure of the Negro society.

In the study of best friend patterns among the college students, the four color designations were: white, light-skin, brown-skin and dark-skin,

¹Robert L. Sutherland, Color, Class and Personality (Washington, D.C., 1942), pp. 61-62.

²W. Lloyd Warner, op. cit., p. 267.

³Ibid., p. 268.

the students were asked to check the color that best described himself and his best friend. Of the total population, as will be pointed out later, few persons considered themselves as dark-skinned, the friendship population being predominantly brown-skinned or lighter. This seems to support Johnson's hypothesis that black or dark skin is associated with evil or ugliness, --certainly it is not a desirable characteristic.

In the break down of the color factor for the four groups, it was found that of the 35 female-female friendships, 16 persons or 45 per cent were of the same color, twelve persons or 35 per cent were lighter than the individual selecting the best friend and seven or 20 per cent were darker than their friends. (See Appendix A, No. 4.)

In the male-male friendship structure which consists of 31 persons, 16 or 52 per cent chose male friends of the same color, five or 16 per cent of the best friends were lighter than the individual and 10 or 14 per cent were darker.

In the female-male friendship, which consist of 21 persons, 13 females or 62 per cent chose male friends of the same color, five or 23 per cent were lighter and three or 13 per cent were darker. (See Appendix A, No. 4.)

In the male-female population of 14 persons, four males or 45 per cent chose female best friends of the same color, eight or 58 per cent were lighter and two or 14 per cent were darker. (Appendix A, No. 4.)

The data permits the following conclusive hypotheses:

The female-female friendship structure revealed that color was not a very important factor in the selection of a best friend, the distribution of friends was fairly proportionate for each category.

In the male-male relationship, however, a different angle of the color factor was found. It is in this group only that a light-skinned person selected as a best friend a dark-skinned person though this was obtained for only a small percentage of the group. However, two light-skinned persons or 6 per cent chose dark-skinned

best friends. It was also revealed that dark-skinned males do not select a light-skinned male as a best friend. In this group there was also found the largest per cent of individuals that considered themselves dark-skinned. This further substantiates Sutherland's thesis that the color factor was not as important in the case of males as in female relationships.

Of the total friendship population only 3 persons or 3 per cent considered themselves dark-skinned and they were in the male-male category.

The color factor was of primary importance in the selection of a best friend in the male-female category. Of the 14 persons in the group, eight or 58 per cent selected a female best friend lighter than himself. In only one case does the male choose a darker-skinned female friend and that when the male is light-skinned and selects a brown-skinned female friend. Never does the male select one darker than brown-skin. If there is any deviation it is found in the selection of a female best friend of the same light-color as himself. In no case was there found a brown-skinned or a dark-skinned male who selected a dark-skinned female friend.

In the female-male category, color was not as important as in the male-female. Females tend to choose male friends of the same color. Of the 21 in the friendship population of this group, 13 or 62 per cent were of the same color. Twelve or 57 per cent were brown-skinned. In no case, however, was there found, a dark-skinned female selecting a dark-skinned male friend. This was also true in the male-female friendship category. The dark-skinned female shows the tendency to follow the pattern of the male in the male-female category. The dark-skinned female selected a male best friend of lighter skin color than herself. Two or 9 per cent selected males that were light-skinned and the same per cent (9) selected brown-skinned friends.

From this analysis, the data suggested that the color factor is highly significant in the selection of a best friend among the college students studied. There was found a marked tendency for the individual to choose a best friend of the same color or lighter, and that few students consider themselves dark-skinned, the taboo color among Negroes. Individuals tend to select as best friends those of the same chronological age and marital status. It is also significant that most best friendships are intra-sexual rather than inter-sexual.

These factors support the conclusions of the Neugarten and Smith studies that the best friends tend to have the same general characteristics as the individual choosing that friend.

CHAPTER III

THE "SELF"--A COMPOSITE TYPE

One method of analyzing the best friend relationship is to give composite pictures of the self elements revealed in the friendship pattern. These composite types are qualitative summaries on persons naming their best friends. They will illustrate the factors of "similarity" and reflection of "self," indicated by Neugarten and Smith in their previously cited studies. These composites may also serve to interpret those values that inhere in the friendships studied, a phase of the analysis discussed in subsequent pages.

The composite self, a person 21 years old, single, male or female, southern born and college trained, considers himself as an average person in almost all of the characteristics studied.

He considers himself average in physical energy and very intelligent. Although he isn't brilliant, he doesn't think of himself as dull. He chooses his friends from those whom he considers as intelligent as himself or more so. He is very sociable and friendly, priding himself on having many friends. He is well controlled, "seldom flying off the handle." He is neither nervous nor neurotic and thinks that this stability has been instrumental in making him very popular with other people. He thinks of himself as the life of the party, an asset to any social function.

His religious attitudes are those of the average person, being neither an atheist nor a religious fanatic, but accepting religion as a practical and good form of social behavior. In meeting his appointments he is usually very punctual and is impatient with those who are tardy. However, he isn't perfect and has been known to be late.

He is courteous and mannerly, in fact, he deems himself almost perfect in these characteristics. "Mr. Average" becomes "Mr. Perfect" in his social behavior, observing all the expected amenities and being the essence of refinement. He is very cooperative and prides himself on his ability to work with anybody. He is diplomatic in his ability to get along with people.

In regards to money, he thinks of himself as being neither stingy nor extremely generous. If he feels it is possible for him to lend money he does so willingly, however, he is cautious and practical in this respect.

"Mr. Average" is fairly ambitious, aspiring for all the good things of life. When he begins a task, he believes in seeing it through, as long as he believes it is possible. However, if too many obstacles block his way, he may set another goal for himself. He does not believe in trying to do the impossible, is well aware of his abilities and limitations in reaching those things he desires most in life.

"Mr. Average" considers himself extremely honest, just and fair. He has never committed any act that would reflect on his excellent reputation. His friends are expected to exhibit the same characteristics. A dishonest friend would not be tolerated by him. (See Appendix A, No. 1.)

He is a neat dresser, takes great pride in his clothing, wears only the best and latest fashions, and considers himself a regular "Esquire." Only those who dress in a similar manner are among his associates. In a limited way he is patient with other's efforts, but he has been known to lose patience. He is the average individual in this respect, not thinking of himself as long-suffering. He wouldn't endure the trials and failures of his life without some complaints, usually telling them to his best friend.

Self has an interest in many things, and is considered by his friends to be an individual well-versed in living. Usually he has a very optimistic

disposition and pleasant personality that makes him well liked by all with whom he comes in contact. He is a good sport, being able to win or lose without a display of temper or taking advantage of those who did not succeed as well.

The Self is the quiet, well bred type. He is never boisterous or loud, and he considers himself a good conversationalist. If he has anything to say it is well worth hearing--he thinks. He dislikes individuals who must be seen and heard, regarding them as uncouth and ill-bred, not worthy of his company. He prefers that his friends be of the same quiet and conservative disposition as himself. Although he is quiet, the Self considers himself as very entertaining, witty and clever. He is a good mixer and wouldn't prove boring to anybody in his company. He is tactful and thoughtful of others' wishes, and if occasionally he is thoughtlessly blunt he is the first to make amends. He has a fair sense of humor, taking pride in his ability to laugh off any situation that might prove embarrassing to him. However, he doesn't care for practical jokers, he considers them as ignorant, ill-bred and unworthy of his friendship.

The Self can always be depended upon to do those things he promises and to make a special effort not to forget any duty he has pledged himself to perform. He is regarded by his friends as very reliable and if there is a special task to be performed he is the first to be called upon--he thinks. (See Appendix A, No. 1.)

He considers himself just average in physical appearance, neither homely nor beautiful, he prides himself on his average looks, feels he may not be outstanding for his beauty but that he will be above the maddening crowd in any social situation because of his pleasant personality,

socialibility and copy-book manners.

He is fairly resourceful, he thinks he does best however, with some guidance from others. He works best with others, thinks of himself not as a leader but as an excellent co-worker. He would rather not assume the responsibility of leadership, but if it proves necessary, he gives it his full attention and uses all the resources in his power.

"Mr. Average" is a cultured, well-reared individual, with a pleasant voice, graceful movements and at ease always in the company of others. He is well-poised, gracious and never doubts his ability to meet any new situation. He possesses a great deal of common sense and is the average conventional person, he considers himself as being neither prudish nor indiscreet. He is not anxious for changes, would rather things go along at an even, moderate pace since rapid changes in any phase of his conversative, conventional and common place existence would upset him and bring about new adjustments that he would rather not make. He is more or less satisfied with his life, accepting each day as it comes, hoping always for the best. He thinks of himself as a sincere person, free from hypocrisy and dissimulation, making an excellent friend. He thinks himself upright, frank and unaffected, and he thinks when he makes a friend he has one for life as he does everything in his power to prove his loyalty and worthiness. From others he expects the same consideration.

"Mr. Average" manages to control his temper in most instances, but thinks he is justified in displaying some temperament when he feels others are infringing on his rights and privileges, he doesn't care to be considered a martyr. He is practically without jealousy. He considers any display of such as unbecoming and primitive and not fitting of one of his training and

social position.

He has an average sense of vanity and pride himself, he neither under-estimates nor over-estimates himself. He feels he has some good traits and is proud of them. He has certain ideas which he is fairly sure are right and will hold to them until a person has given him just cause for changing. He is willing always to listen to another person's ideas and can easily be persuaded to change his opinion if the other individual impresses him as being a good scholar.

He considers himself as unselfish, and endeavors to be always thoughtful and considerate of his friends. He thinks he meets new situations with a great deal of confidence, and has no doubt in his ability to do and act in the correct and expected manner. He is seldom shy or bashful when in the company of strange people.

He doesn't consider himself as a "race man," feeling more or less indifferent about race matters until they have a direct bearing on him. He is neither proud nor ashamed of his race, preferring to disregard "race and think of the one world" concept where all men are brothers. (See Appendix A, No. 1.)

In general the average person considers himself to be the essence of conformity. He is neither perfect nor without faults. In general, he follows the crowd, doing the expected and customary things. He seldom breaks away from traditions, usually following the patterns of behavior set for him by others. He is conventional, cultured and highly intelligent, popular with other people, ambitious to some degree, having a number of interests. He considers himself as having all of the characteristics that make for a friend--loyalty, honesty, even disposition and popularity.

From the above analysis of the composite self it is evident that the average person is a paragon of acceptable moral, social and intellectual virtues, being neither too egocentric nor too social. As a general rule he follows the patterns of his culture accepting the moral values that have been sanctioned by others.

CHAPTER IV

THE BEST FRIEND

The analysis of the composite self in the preceding chapter was constructed in order that we might see the best friend through the conception of the self as held by the person selecting this friend.

The concept, role, characteristics and function of the best friend are the primary concern of this study. All other factors have been used as background data that would better interpret what is meant by the best friend concept in our society. What makes for a best friend? What are the characteristics one finds in him that makes this association of two people, stand united against all other relationships?

In seeking answers to these questions it is necessary to examine the best friend as he is revealed by the 101 persons who selected him.

The analysis will concern itself with those characteristics that are indicated as preeminent in the best friend chosen by the selector. It is the belief of the writer that there is a tendency for the best friend to be idealized by the selector, that he is placed on a pedestal and used as a source of identification.

Neugarten¹ and Smith² regard friendship as a mirror-like reflective of characteristics between the person selecting and the best friend. Smith suggested that friendship choices are egocentric or ego-morphic in character, that the best friend reflects the same general characteristics. In the following pages an analysis of the best friend will explore these factors as

¹Op. cit., p. 305.

²Op. cit., p. 307.

the basic frame of reference.

In the four sex categories, female-female, female-male, male-male and male-female, the best friend is much more outstanding as an individual than the selector. He is considered more intelligent, has a higher degree of socialibility, and is more punctual, and courteous. It appears that in the selection of a best friend the selector compensates for his sense of inferiority by selecting a superior friend and basks in the reflected glory as well as the added security.

In inter-sexual friendships, female-male and male-female, it was found that there was an even greater degree of idealization. However, the courtship factor may enter into these friendship structures and account for the significant fluctuations in the rating of the inter-sexual best friend.

In the female-female best friend pattern, the best friend is regarded as superior to the selector. (See Appendix A. No. 2.) She possesses a dynamic personality and is the leader in the friendship relation. The best friend is more intelligent, has more physical energy, is popular and more punctual in meeting her appointments than is her selector.

The best friend and the Self, however, have similar temperaments, neither has a nervous disposition nor a violent temper, but, of the two, the best friend exhibits more temperamental tendencies.

In such characteristics as honesty, loyalty, and cooperativeness the female best friend is above average. Here again there is a tendency to place the best friend on a pedestal, the best friend appearing to be chosen for those traits that the selector most admires in an individual.

For such traits as conventionalism, sincerity and common sense, the best friend received the same score as the selector. These, apparently,

are characteristics that form a common bond between the two. The best friend reflects the attitudes of the selector on basic opinions, which also may be the foundation upon which the friendship was built.

The female tends to select a friend who is her superior in many characteristics, yet in those traits that make for strong friends, such as, cooperativeness, honesty, tact, sense of humor, ability to meet new situations, religious attitudes and race consciousness, they have in general the same rating.

In physical appearance the female best friend is considered as more attractive and as having a great deal more vanity than her female selector. She is a much better dresser, and in social affairs of the two, she is the more entertaining, enterprising and more resourceful individual.

In the female-female friendship pattern there is a tendency for the best friend and selector to receive higher ratings and to exhibit more similar traits than in any other sex category. (Appendix A. Nos. 1 and 2). In this category the theory of similarity by Neugarten is more prevalent than in the other sex categories. It appears the female best friend is selected because of the number of factors she has in common with the selector. This makes for a mutual bond and a common interest between the two.

The male best friend and his male selector received the same rating on such traits as popularity, ability to stick to a task, and the number of interests in common. There was a wide difference in the evaluation of the best friend and self in socialability. In this characteristic the best friend far exceeds the selector.

They are both "self starters," without jealousy, and having similar

qualities in voice, pleasant if not melodious. In their movements both are considered fairly graceful being neither extremely graceful nor awkward. The best friend and selector are conventional to a point, being a little above average. They fit generally into the conventional and customary ways of behavior as do the female-female friends.

In such characteristics as intelligence, socialability, manners, honesty and tactfulness the best friend is rated very high. It seems that these exceptional qualities are expected in a best friend although they are not necessarily found in the selector.

In the male-male and female-female friendship pattern it is evident that the best friend is selected more for trait-similarity than in the inter-sexual categories. In the inter-sexual categories outstanding characteristics for the best friend are more prominent.

In the inter-sexual best friend patterns there exist marked differences in the evaluation received in the female-male and male-female categories. The female tends to idealize the male best friend, thinking of him as the epitome of perfection. (See Appendix A. No. 2.) To her the male best friend is her "ideal." He represents the type that she would consider for a husband or father.

The male who selects a female best friend is not as idealistic as the female in her selection of a male friend. In such traits as social grace and diplomacy, or those traits he considers effeminate he deems it possible that the female may be his superior. (See Appendix A. No. 2.) However, he is the aggressor, the leader and the female chosen generally fits into the pattern of his expensive self.

In these two categories the old stereotyped idea of the role of men and

women in society is brought forth. The female appears to think of the males as the Knight in shining armor, while the male considers himself as Lancelot coming to the rescue of the helpless maiden. Here is the element of dominance and subordination in the friendship pattern that is suggested by Simmel in his previously cited study.¹

In the female-male friendship pattern, the male best friend is regarded as more intelligent, more sociable, and having more physical energy, a characteristic that one would expect for males selected by females as the "he-man-type" is the stereotype of the ideal man. (See Appendix A. No. 2.) He is considered as being extremely popular with other people, and a better dresser, a characteristic that women usually reserve for themselves. In physical appearance, too, the male is considered the more attractive, the more dependable, and possessing a better sense of humor.

The college trained female in selecting the male best friend evidently is consciously or unconsciously selecting the type that she considers would make an "ideal" mate. From the facts revealed, it is apparent that the romance and courtship factor enter into their choice. It may be that the female in selecting a male friend is unconsciously selecting a male, who could be considered more than a best friend. While this study did not reveal the factors that enter into the choice of a best friend of the opposite sex, it does open an interesting field for further investigation of inter-sexual friendship patterns.

The male is not as idealistic in his selection of a friend of the opposite sex as is the female. He readily acknowledges those traits in

¹Op. cit., p. 180.

which he considers himself the superior to the female. He has more physical energy, he is more popular and has a greater number of friends. In such characteristics as honesty, courtesy, patience and tact the female far exceeds the male. He acknowledges these characteristics as predominantly feminine, and regards them in the extreme forms as undesirable in the male.

The male tends to select the female best friend in many respects for her physical appearance. As in the color factor he selects one that is regarded as "beautiful," "talented" or "best dresser." She is the type that would be described as "most popular," "most cultured" or by other similar labels.

The female best friend is considered by the male as beautiful, graceful, as having a melodious voice and extremely cultured. She is a leader in social affairs, and would preside graciously over any social function. These may be characteristics the male seeks in his choice of a mate. The male-female and female-male categories appear to emphasize qualities that are significant in courtship and marriage patterns. The characteristics the best friend exhibits are those usually expected of a mate. This leads to the question, can there be inter-sexual best friends, as best friend was defined in the introductory chapter, or is the Dahomey idea,¹ a best friend of the same sex, the only true basis for a best friend? Emerson raised a similar question, can real friendship exist across sex lines in his poem "Friendship?"²

A ruddy drop of manly blood
The surging sea outweighs,

¹Melville Herskovits, op. cit., p. 627.

²Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Friendship," Major American Writers, ed., H. M. Jones and Ernest E. Leisy (New York, 1944), p. 367.

The world uncertain comes and goes,
 The lover rooted stays.
 I fancied he was fled,--
 And, after many a year,
 Glowed unexhausted kindliness,
 Like daily sunrise there.
 My careful heart was free again,
 O, friend, my bosom said,
 Through thee the rose is red;
 All things through thee take nobler form,
 And look beyond the earth,
 The mill-round of our fate appears
 A sun-path in thy worth.
 Me too thy nobleness has taught
 To master my despair.
 The fountains of my hidden life
 Are through thy friendship fair.

Again, though these questions are not within the scope of this study they indicate the need of further study of the best friend pattern.

For the convenience of analysis, the best friend concept was broken down into the four categories discussed, in an effort to compare and contrast the best friend pattern in its inter-and-intra-sexual aspects. The final analysis concerns itself with the general nature of the role "best friend."

In general the best friend tends to be the superior person in the friendship structure, he has all those characteristics that make for lasting friendship. He is courteous, cooperative, honest and fair, he has a happy disposition, is popular, tactful and a good sport, entertaining, cultured and very thoughtful of others. It seems that the selector rejects as a friend one who is regarded as his inferior. This may be the result of the absence of a common interest, or of the rejected person being considered as dull, uninteresting and common-place. He doesn't bring to the friendship structure the dynamic interesting personality of the superior person. The best friend is a reflection of the self as he would desire himself to

be. The best friend is chosen to a certain degree for the benefits that can be derived from such an association. Here the best friend is unconsciously exploited by the selector. The material element indicated in the Manus friendships,¹ seems to be a basic counterpart of the friendship relationship in our culture. This analysis reveals that such traits as mutual confidence, interest in the welfare and opinions of the best friend are not the essential characteristics; in the final analysis, such traits as physical appearance, popularity, socialability, style of dress and color are the deciding factors in the best friend selection.

From the above analysis it would appear that the best friend concept is a myth. This is not the conclusion of the writer, however, for every society a concept takes on different meanings and values. The idea and symbols in back of the best friend are the important elements. As was previously cited in the studies of Dahomey and Manus, friendship can serve many functions and purposes. For the particular group studied, the factors of immaturity and mobility may account for the selection of a friend for physical traits rather than for the intimate relationships that are formed through close and sustained associations.

The similarities found between the best friend and the self were sufficiently significant to permit substantiation of the thesis of Neugarten² and Smith³ in their theory of similarities between friends. The best friend was superior in many traits, yet there were enough like characteristics between the two for the formation of the friendship which otherwise

¹Op. cit., p. 309.

²Op. cit., p. 310.

³Margaret Mead, op. cit., p. 81.

would not have existed. It is not possible to conceive of the best friend and the self as having polar personalities, for in this study the basic traits: loyalty, fairness, sincerity, unselfishness and cooperativeness, necessary for the best friend pattern were consistently related between the friend and the selector.

CHAPTER V

THE FRIENDSHIP STRUCTURE

The friendship structure is a composite relation of the best friend and the self, the selector. Through an analysis of its structure it was possible to derive gestalt of the general characteristics of the total friendship population. Although the data indicates that, for analytical purposes the friendship structure is not as important as the best friend role. However, it is of greater import that the self-role because of tendency of the self to be played down, and correspondingly to exploit the best friend relationship.

The friendship structure data were obtained by computing the median scores for the self and best friend on each question for the four sex categories and the total population. (See Appendix A, No. 3.) From the total median scores the mean score was computed for each question and for each category. From the mean scores on each item a general picture of the total friendship population was obtained for those characteristics rated high or low for the total relationship.

The friendship structure is important as it gives an over-all picture of how a group of college students regard themselves and their friends.

For the convenience of analysis the four sex categories will again be discussed separately, with the total population discussed last in an effort to give a clear and concise picture of the general population.

The female-female friendship from an analysis of the general scores of the friendship structure, revealed rather high scores on a large number of characteristics. (Appendix A, No. 3.) Of the 37 questions, this type

of friendship received high scores for 14. On the other questions they were considered average or a small degree above average. In the personal traits and cultural conditioning of self category, in such characteristics as punctuality, courtesy, honesty, patience, sincerity and common sense, the female friendship received the highest scores. In general, the female friendship was considered an extremely cultured, punctual, cooperative, courteous, fair and very patient one, being very persistent in a task begun. Furthermore the female friendship is an extremely well dressed one with numerous interests and great dependability.

In physical energy and intelligence the friendship was found to be above average. The structure was reasonably sociable but not extremely out-going.

In general the female friends considered themselves as the quiet and conservative type, they are thoughtful of others, neither good nor bad sports, but experiencing some difficulty in accepting defeat.

The female friendship was average in physical appearance, generally described as composed of attractive, graceful, modest and refined women; neither exceptional nor dull but reflecting the expected patterns set for cultured young ladies. They are women who would fit well in any social situation because of their ability to get along well with others. They are not leaders, but persons who would rather be the inconspicuous, retiring types that need guidance and stimulus for action. Their desires of life would seem to be to marry, have a few of the luxuries of life and live happily ever after.

The tendency for females to idealize the male was very much in evidence from the scores revealed in the female-female friendship structure

(Appendix A, No. 3). It was interesting to compare and contrast the high and low scores in the structure. There seemed to be a sexual dividing line between the traits regarded as strictly male and traits that were predominantly female. This tendency to sexually identify behavior traits was also found in the male-female structure.

The male scored high on most social characteristics, whereas, the female was high in personal characteristics. The male half of the friendship was described as nice-looking, a neat dresser, and as having a pleasant personality. He is courteous and very cooperative. In sports the male is considered as a very good sport, honest and fair. The female thinks of the male as the more cultured and refined half of the structure. In all other traits the male is the average individual, having the same general characteristics as the female selector.

The male-male friendship structure was very similar to the other two previously discussed structures. In only one characteristic was there a significant difference -- intelligence. The male-male friendship structure is regarded as an extremely intelligent one. In only one other structure were there such high scores, the male-female friendships.

The general scoring of the friendship structure for the male-female category was relatively high on most characteristics. (See Appendix A, No. 3). The male in general selects an attractive girl, who dresses well, and is cultured and refined. She has a high degree of intelligence, is popular, tactful and very dependable. On all social traits the female chosen by the male received a high rating. These characteristics have been found throughout the study more closely related to the female than to the male. Her feminine role demands that she be a modest, conventional

person, the essence of culture and refinement.

From the number of analyses given of the self, the best friend, and the friendship structure it should now be evident that people tend to consider themselves and friends as fairly average individuals, few would fall into the upper limits of our population grouping. The friendships contained no future race leaders, no race baiters, no religious fanatics, no atheists, no beauties, no physical monstrosities, no Einsteins, no morons, only plain folk, having some traits above average, but who in general thought well of themselves as representatives of the traditional, conventional middle class folk found in any community.

On almost all characteristics the general population received the rating of average. They deemed themselves as physically energetic, sociable, as having average control of their tempers and reasonably popular. They are fairly religious, can be counted on to give some support to their church, though they do not believe in straining their purse strings.

The population was found to be fairly modern, they do believe, however, that some of the old customs and traditions are still good. From the data received on honesty, it isn't possible that any will ever be apprehended by the law as all think themselves very honest, fair and just.

The group was outstanding for its mediocrity, and could with a fair degree of certainty be called Average Americans. However, the primary concern of the best friend pattern study was to ascertain if individuals in selecting a best friend chose them primarily because of the existence of similar traits. The writer was also interested in the color factor as previously discussed, and the role it exercised in the choice of a friend.

The Neugarten¹ and Smith² studies, supplemented with the studies of Jenkins,³ Williams,⁴ and Frankel⁵ were used as guides in this analysis.

Neugarten⁶ maintained that friends were selected because of the existence of similar traits. Her study was based on the social and economic aspects of children's lives and their selection of friends because of a similar manner of dress, occupation of parents and family background.

In the study of the best friend pattern among college students it was found that the individual was more inclined to select as a best friend one who had traits that were similar or superior to their own. In no instance was there found too great a range between the characteristics of the selector and the best friend. The greatest difference in characteristics was found in inter-sexual friendships. In these categories the "in-category" and the "out-categories" found in Smith's⁷ study were more evident. The "in-category," those persons having the same general characteristics, was most evident in intra-sexual friendship patterns -- male-male and female-female, the "out-category," or persons having different characteristics was found in the inter-sexual pattern -- male-female and female-male. Such traits as patience, courtesy, culture, refinement and reliability were qualities assigned to their female friends by males, and the qualities

¹Op. cit., p. 305.

²Op. cit., p. 303.

³Gladys Jenkins, "Factors Involved in Children's Friendships," The Journal of Educational Psychology XXII (September, 1931), p. 440.

⁴Paul Williams, "A Study of Adolescent Friendships," Pedagogical Seminary, XXX (December, 1923), p. 342.

⁵Esther B. Frankel, "A Survey of Sociometric and Pre-Sociometric Literature on Friendship and Social Acceptance Among Children," Sociometry, VII (November, 1944), p. 422.

⁶Op. cit., p. 313.

⁷Op. cit., p. 307.

being a good sport, entertaining, physically energetic and resourceful. were assigned to the males by their female best friends.

In those characteristics that made for good friends, such as honesty, fairness, ability to get along with people, tact and cooperativeness, there was a marked similarity between the selector and best friend.

Economic status and family background were not deemed important factors in the selection of a best friend in this study. This was also found to be true by Neugarten in her study of children when they reached the high school level.¹ The acceptance of friends was based more on personal appearance and talents, rather than family background. This conclusion was also supported by the data collected in this study. The occupation of the father was of little importance as best friends were selected from all occupational strata. The selector with a professional father selected in many instances as a best friend one whose father was in the skilled or semi-skilled class or vice versa.

Since the college students are a select group it could be presumed that they are of the upper socio-economic stratum or will in the future attain that level, and that family background has or will lose some of its importance. The "most popular," "best dressed" and "most talented" factors, operated as the important criteria for the best friend on this level.

The color factor in this study was most revealing in its importance in selecting a best friend. From the data collected in some friendships a best friend is selected as much for his color as any other characteristic (See Appendix A, No. 4.) The analysis of color revealed that the selector chooses a best friend of the same color or lighter, brown skin being the

¹Op. cit., p. 313.

predominate color of the friendship population. Few persons considered themselves or their friends as dark-skinned. The stigma attached to the color black was evident for the general population. Johnson¹ states that individuals escape, in their own minds at least, some of the unfavorable association of dark skin by appraising themselves as lighter than they are. This may be an important factor in the group studied since it selected brown skin as the predominate skin color. (Appendix A, No. 4.)

The color selection was more prominent in inter-sexual relations than in any other category, particularly in the male-female structure. The male may select a female best friend of the same color, if they themselves are brown skinned or if either is of a darker complexion. The female is always of a lighter-skin than her male friend. In this group the dark-skinned male never selected a dark-skinned female best friend.

In the female-male friendship structure color was not so important as in the male-female one, yet it was found that few dark-skinned males were selected as best friends by females, the brown-skin male was the preferred best friend. Only in the male-male friendship pattern were there found persons who considered themselves dark-skinned and selected a dark skinned male best friend.

This preference for friends of the same or a lighter color leads the writer to conclude color selection is a very important criterion of social class and social relationship in the group studied, and, a very important factor in the selection of a best friend.

The general conclusions drawn from this study are: (1) the best friend

¹Op. cit., p. 265.

is chosen by the selector more for similar than for dissimilar characteristics; (2) that the greatest differences in characteristics exist in the inter-sexual friendship relations -- female-male, and male-female; (3) that the best friend tends to be of the same chronological age as the selector; (4) that color was of primary importance in the selection of a best friend except in male-male relations; (5) that brown-skin was the predominant color for the group studied; (6) that the occupation of the father was relatively unimportant in the choice of a best friend; (7) that the friendship population considered itself average in most characteristics studied; (8) that the best friend was considered the superior on most traits as compared to the selector, except where such traits were valued as sex-linked ones; and (9) that the best friend is generally of the same sex as the selector.

The serious limitations of the techniques and methods of this study permit it to be no more than an exploratory one, designed to open up several channels for future research. The group of two continues to remain an important social relationship in our society. The "best friend" is a social role of intricate social variety and meaning; influenced by formal and informal, social and personal controls. The friendship structure itself presents an added body of social data that must be explored. In short this analysis permits the establishment of another hypothesis that may serve to continue the research of Neugarten, Smith et. al., to wit: The nature of the best friend relationship is influenced by at least three major phenomena, age, sex and social interests, each and all of which tend to produce variable types of friendship structures. Thus, the construction of scales with which to measure the best friend pattern should be related to items regarded as common to the interest group studied, since friendship apparently is related to the phenomena of social role and social class.

APPENDIX

METHOD OF SCORING AND STATISTICAL COMPUTATIONS

For the purpose of analysis, the data collected in this study was computed for the self, the best friend and the friendship structure. The three patterns were broken down into four sex categories--female-female, male-male, male-female and female-male, to facilitate comparison and contrast of characteristics between the inter-sexual and intra-sexual categories.

The questionnaire administered was constructed on a nine point scale, five (5) being the average rating, one (1) and nine (9) receiving high values, respectively for each characteristic. Those characteristics receiving a high rating were encircled to facilitate comparison between the categories.

Appendix A1, is the computed mean score for each item on the questionnaire for the composite self. It is the rating of the self on all characteristics for each sex category. The total column indicates the mean rating of each characteristic for the total self-population.

Appendix A2--The computed mean for the persons chosen as the best friend in the four sex categories, with the mean score for the total best friend population. From the computations it was possible to compare and contrast the rating of characteristics for the inter-sexual and intra-sexual categories. The computed data provided a composite picture of those characteristics for which a best friend is chosen.

Appendix A3--The friendship structure is the mean score for the self and the best friend. It is a composite picture of the self and best friend and their rating on each characteristic. The total column gives

the average rating for the total population. This compilation provides a configurational pattern of the students studied.

Appendix A4--Correlation between age of self and best friend. This shows the significance of the age factor in the choice of the best friend.

Appendix A5--The color of self and best friend was computed to discover what percentage of the population chose friends of the same color, lighter or darker skin color. Percentages were computed for the four sex categories and total population.

Appendix B1--Questionnaire administered to 101 college students which was designed to study the relationship between certain physical and social characteristics of the self and best friend.

Appendices B2, B3, B4--Tabulation method and score distribution for the self, the best friend and the friendship structure.

APPENDIX A1

COMPUTED MEAN SCORES ON EACH CHARACTERISTIC FOR FOUR SEX CATEGORIES OF THE COMPOSITE SELF AND TOTAL SELF STRUCTURE

Questions	Total	Female-Female	Female-Male	Male-Male	Male-Female
1	5.9	4.6	5.4	6.4	(7.2)
2	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	(3.0)
3	4.2	4.6	4.6	4.7	(3.0)
4	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.2
5	6.5	6.3	6.6	6.0	(7.2)
6	4.7	4.0	5.0	5.5	4.3
7	6.5	6.0	6.2	(7.3)	6.5
8	(7.3)	(7.0)	(7.2)	(8.2)	6.6
9	3.7	3.0	4.4	(3.0)	4.5
10	4.5	3.9	4.7	4.7	4.8
11	5.9	6.8	5.0	6.0	6.0
12	(7.3)	(8.1)	(7.3)	(7.5)	6.5
13	(3.4)	(3.3)	(3.4)	(3.9)	3.0
14	4.5	4.8	5.4	4.0	4.0
15	6.7	(7.3)	5.3	6.5	(7.7)
16	4.0	(3.9)	3.9	4.3	4.0
17	4.4	4.5	4.3	(3.5)	5.2
18	6.1	5.8	6.3	5.8	6.5
19	4.5	4.9	4.0	4.9	4.0
20	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.6
21	(3.4)	(3.6)	(3.6)	4.7	(2.0)

APPENDIX A1 (Continued)

Questions	Total	Female-Female	Female-Male	Male-Male	Male-Female
22	(7.3)	(7.9)	(7.5)	(7.5)	6.3
23	5.5	5.0	5.7	5.6	5.6
24	4.3	4.0	3.0	4.6	5.5
25	5.3	5.1	5.5	5.2	5.5
26	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.5	6.6
27	6.3	6.0	6.8	5.0	(7.3)
28	4.4	4.9	4.5	4.0	4.5
29	(3.0)	(3.4)	(2.0)	(3.7)	(3.0)
30	5.7	5.7	5.9	6.3	5.0
31	(3.6)	(3.6)	(3.6)	(3.0)	4.5
32	6.0	6.5	5.0	5.8	(7.0)
33	5.6	6.0	6.5	5.5	4.5
34	5.8	6.0	5.0	5.5	6.5
35	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.6
36	6.4	6.0	5.7	6.5	(7.5)
37	5.8	6.3	5.0	5.5	6.5
High Scores	(8)	(11)	(8)	(9)	(10)

Encircled figures are characteristics receiving high values.

APPENDIX A2

COMPUTED MEAN SCORE FOR PERSONS CHOSEN AS BEST FRIEND ON EACH CHARACTERISTIC FOR FOUR SEX CATEGORIES AND TOTAL BEST FRIEND STRUCTURE

Questions	Total	Female-Female	Female-Male	Male-Male	Male-Female
1	6.5	6.0	6.8	(7.4)	6.0
2	(6.8)	4.5	(3.6)	(3.0)	4.2
3	(3.9)	4.2	(3.9)	(3.7)	(3.8)
4	4.5	4.0	(3.7)	(3.8)	6.5
5	6.7	(7.3)	(7.6)	6.0	6.0
6	5.0	5.1	5.5	5.2	4.0
7	6.4	6.3	6.1	6.0	(7.2)
8	(8.4)	(8.3)	(8.2)	(8.5)	(7.6)
9	(3.2)	(3.3)	(3.3)	(3.0)	(3.3)
10	(3.7)	(3.7)	(3.6)	4.2	(3.3)
11	7.1	(7.8)	(7.2)	6.0	(7.7)
12	7.5	(8.3)	(7.6)	(7.0)	(7.0)
13	(2.6)	(2.4)	(2.9)	(2.9)	(2.3)
14	(3.7)	(3.0)	(3.0)	4.7	4.3
15	6.8	(7.3)	(7.3)	6.5	6.3
16	(3.9)	(3.8)	(3.6)	4.2	4.0
17	(3.7)	(3.7)	(2.7)	(3.2)	5.1
18	5.5	5.7	6.3	5.3	5.0
19	(3.0)	(3.8)	(2.8)	(2.0)	(3.3)
20	4.3	4.6	(3.6)	4.5	4.6
21	(3.4)	(3.8)	(2.7)	(3.4)	4.0

APPENDIX A2 (Continued)

Questions	Total	Female-Female	Female-Male	Male-Male	Male-Female
22	(7.9)	(8.1)	(8.4)	(7.0)	(8.3)
23	6.5	(7.1)	6.8	5.0	(7.4)
24	4.0	4.4	(3.5)	4.2	4.2
25	5.5	5.3	5.6	5.2	6.0
26	(7.3)	(7.4)	(7.4)	6.7	(7.6)
27	7.1	6.8	(7.3)	6.3	(8.2)
28	4.6	4.9	5.2	4.0	4.5
29	(3.0)	(3.3)	(2.4)	(3.2)	(3.0)
30	6.1	5.6	6.4	6.2	6.2
31	(3.4)	(3.5)	(2.9)	(3.8)	(3.6)
32	5.8	6.0	5.0	7.2	5.0
33	5.6	6.4	5.0	5.8	5.5
34	6.1	5.0	6.9	5.0	(7.5)
35	(3.7)	(3.6)	(3.4)	(3.0)	4.6
36	6.7	6.6	6.0	6.0	(8.0)
37	6.0	6.2	5.9	5.6	6.5
High Scores	(16)	(19)	(24)	(16)	(17)

Encircled figures are characteristics receiving high values.

APPENDIX A3

COMPUTED MEAN SCORES FOR SELF AND BEST FRIEND ON EACH CHARACTERISTIC FOR THE FOUR SEX CATEGORIES AND TOTAL FRIENDSHIP STRUCTURE

Questions	Total	Female-Female	Female-Male	Male-Male	Male-Female
1	6.9	5.3	6.1	6.9	6.6
2	(3.9)	4.1	4.3	(3.5)	(3.1)
3	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.2	(3.4)
4	4.4	4.0	(3.8)	(3.9)	5.8
5	6.6	6.8	(7.1)	6.0	6.6
6	4.8	4.5	5.2	5.3	4.1
7	6.4	(7.0)	6.1	6.6	6.8
8	(7.8)	(7.6)	(7.7)	(8.3)	(7.1)
9	(3.4)	(3.1)	(3.8)	(3.0)	(3.9)
10	4.0	(3.8)	4.1	4.4	4.0
11	6.5	(7.3)	6.1	6.0	6.8
12	(7.4)	(8.2)	(7.4)	(7.2)	6.7
13	(3.0)	(2.8)	(3.7)	(3.4)	(2.6)
14	4.1	(3.9)	4.2	4.3	4.1
15	6.7	(7.3)	6.3	6.5	(7.0)
16	(3.9)	(3.8)	(3.7)	4.2	4.0
17	4.0	4.1	(3.5)	(3.3)	5.1
18	5.8	5.7	6.3	5.5	5.7
19	(3.7)	4.3	(3.4)	(3.4)	(3.6)
20	4.4	4.6	4.0	4.6	4.6

APPENDIX A3 (Continued)

Questions	Total	Female-Female	Female-Male	Male-Male	Male-Female
21	(3.4)	(3.7)	(3.1)	4.0	(3.0)
22	(7.6)	(8.0)	(7.9)	(7.2)	(7.3)
23	6.0	6.0	6.2	5.3	6.5
24	4.1	4.2	(3.2)	4.4	4.8
25	5.4	5.2	5.5	5.2	5.7
26	6.6	6.7	6.2	6.6	(7.1)
27	6.7	6.4	(7.0)	5.6	(7.7)
28	4.5	4.9	4.8	4.0	4.5
29	(3.0)	(3.3)	(2.2)	(3.4)	(3.0)
30	5.8	5.6	6.1	6.2	5.6
31	(3.5)	(3.5)	(3.2)	(3.4)	4.0
32	5.9	6.2	5.0	6.5	6.0
33	5.6	6.2	5.7	5.6	5.0
34	5.9	5.5	5.9	5.2	7.0
35	4.1	4.1	(3.9)	(3.8)	4.6
36	6.5	6.3	5.8	6.2	(7.7)
37	5.9	6.2	5.4	5.5	6.5
High Scores	(11)	(14)	(16)	(12)	(14)

Encircled Figures are characteristics receiving high values.

APPENDIX A4

CORRELATION BETWEEN AGE OF THE "SELF" AND BEST FRIEND

CORRELATION BETWEEN AGE OF THE "SELF" AND BEST FRIEND											
Friend You	18-20	21-23	24-26	27-29	30-32	33-35	fy	y ¹	fy ¹	fy ²	ex ¹ y ¹
18-20	25	5	3	1	1		35	0	0	0	0
	(1) 3		(-1) 6		(-3) 1		24	-1	-34	34	-6
21-23	2		-6								
	(2) 1	6	(-2) 7	(-4) 3			17	-2	-34	68	-24
24-26	2		-14	-12							
		2	(-3) 2	(-6) 5	(-4) 2	(-12) 1	12	-3	-36	108	-66
27-29			-6	-30	-18	-12					
		1		1			2	-4	-8	32	-8
30-32											
						(-20) 1 -20	1	-5	-5	25	-20
33-35											
fx	29	38	18	10	4	2	101				
x ¹	-1	0	/1	/2	/3	/4					
fx ¹	-29	0	/18	/20	/12	/8	= /29				
fx ²	29	0	-18	-40	-36	-32	= 155				
ex ¹ y ¹	/5	0	-26	-50	-21	-32	= 124				
r = -.65 ± .05											

APPENDIX A5

COLOR AND BEST FRIEND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION

Self	Friend	Same Color		Lighter		Darker	
		No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Female	Female	16	45	12	35	7	20
Female	Male	13	62	5	23	3	13
Male	Male	16	52	5	16	10	32
Male	Female	4	29	8	58	2	14
Total							
101		49	47	30	34	22	20

APPENDIX B1

THE BEST FRIEND PATTERN

This questionnaire is designed to study the relationship between certain physical and social characteristics of yourself and your best friend.

BACKGROUND DATA

1. Please fill in blanks below for you and your best friend.

YOU				CATEGORY	YOUR BEST FRIEND			
				OCCUPATION OF FATHER				
				AGE (Insert age next birthday)				
				SEX (Insert M or F)				
				BIRTH PLACE (Insert city and state)				
				MARITAL STATUS (Insert one (S) (M) (W) (D))				
White	Light skin	Brown skin	Dark skin	COLOR (Check one for you and for your best friend)	White	Light skin	Brown skin	Dark skin

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is a "test to discover how you see your best friend and how you think about him. Friendships differ greatly and on many traits some friends show striking average differences.

You are being asked to rate yourself and your best friend, male or female, on a number of personality traits. In each case, think of the friend's average behavior, not some outstanding or unusual trait.

Question 1 reads:

Is he physically energetic and "peppy?"

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
easily fatigued, no pep					energetic, peppy			

The pronoun he refers in all cases to your friend, whether male or female. You are to think of your friend and rate him or her from 1 to 9 by putting a circle, (), around the number most appropriately describing him. On such a scale, the average for all people would be at the exact center, which is 5. The ends of the scale indicate the extremes of the characteristic and all other forms of the behavior fall somewhere in between. You will also evaluate yourself on the same scale, placing an x over the number which most appropriately describes you.

Consider each trait separately. Don't fall into the error of rating your friend high on all traits simply because he is high on some, or yourself low on all, because you rate low on some. Individuals may be very high on some characteristics and very low on others. For example, in the example given above I am almost a weakling, but my best friend is almost perpetual motion.

Remember that all of these results are confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Be sure you understand the directions, otherwise your rating will not be of any value. Do not confer with anyone in making your ratings. Place an 0 over the number for your friend and an X for yourself.

MY BEST FRIEND

1. Is he physically energetic and "peppy?"

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
easily fatigued, no pep						energetic, peppy		

2. How intelligent is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
brilliant							very dull	

3. How sociable and friendly is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
extremely sociable, friendly							unsociable	

4. Is he nervous and does he "fly off the handle" easily?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very calm						impetuous		
well controlled						easily upset		

5. Is he popular with other people?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
disliked						very popular		
shunned						"life of the party"		

6. What are his attitudes about religion?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very religious						not at all religious		

7. How does he meet his appointments?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
frequently tardy						very punctual		
does not mind coming late						never late		

8. How courteous and polite is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
discourteous							very courteous	
ill-bred							good manners	

9. How cooperative is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very cooperative							uncooperative	

10. How is he in regard to money?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very generous							very stingy	

11. How well does he stick to a task?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
easily discouraged							keeps on trying	
loses interest							very persistent	

12. How honest and fair is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
dishonest							extremely honest	
unfair							just and fair	

13. How does he dress?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very neat							careless, pays little	
							attention to his clothes	

14. Is he patient?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very patient							extremely impatient	

15. Are his interests wide or narrow?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very narrow							extremely wide	
interested in few things							very curious	

16. What is his usual disposition?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
optimistic							pessimistic	
happy							unhappy	

17. Is he a good sport or a poor one?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very good sport						poor sport		
takes defeat well						can't stand losing		

18. Is he generally quiet or boisterous?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
boisterous, noisy						very quiet		
must be heard						talks little		

19. Is he boring or entertaining?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very entertaining						uninteresting		
extremely interesting						very boring		

20. Is he tactful and diplomatic?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
thoughtful of others						very blunt, undiplomatic		
diplomatic, always tactful						says anything he thinks		

21. How good is his sense of humor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
good sense of humor						no sense of humor		
						dislikes jokes		

22. Can you count on him to do things?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
unreliable						very dependable		
indifferent						conscientious		

23. Is he physically attractive

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very homely						beautiful		
						very good looking		

24. How much initiative does he have? Is he a "self-starter?"

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
resourceful, much initiative						lacking in		
does things "on his own"						initiative		

25. How jealous is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
without jealousy						very jealous		

26. What sort of voice does he have?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
annoying						melodious		
unpleasant						very pleasant		

27. How "cultured" is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
practically without "culture"						extremely "cultured"		

28. Is he awkward or graceful in his movements?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
extremely graceful						very awkward		
						clumsy		

29. Does he possess common sense?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
has a great deal of						lacks common sense		
common sense								

30. How conventional is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
unconventional						very conventional		

31. How sincere is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very sincere						insincere		

32. What kind of temper does he have?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
decidedly ill-natured						rarely angered		
uncivil, easily angered						exceptional self-control		

33. How vain is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very vain, proud						modest, unpretending		
egotistic, conceited						unassuming		

34. Does he have definite ideas which he is sure are right?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
intolerant						extremely tolerant		
stubborn, prejudiced						without prejudice		

35. How selfish and self-centered is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
unselfish						selfish		
thoughtful, considerate						inconsiderate		

36. How does he meet new social situations?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
bashful, shy						confident		
embarrassed						self-assured		

37. How race conscious is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
feels very keenly						never thinks or		
about his race						acts "racially"		

APPENDIX B2

SCORE DISTRIBUTION--ALL VALUES (SELF)

Score	Total	Female-Female	Female-Male	Male-Male	Male-Female	
			/		/	
2-2.9	(0)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(1)	2
	///	/// //	///	///	///	
3.-3.9	(5)	(7)	(5)	(5)	(5)	27
	/// /// ///	/// /// //	/// ///	/// /// //	/// ///	
4.-4.9	(13)	(12)	(9)	(12)	(9)	55*
	/// ///	///	/// /// ///	/// ///	/// //	
5.-5.9	(8)	(4)	(14)	(9)	(7)	42
	/// ///	/// ///	///	/// //	/// ///	
6-6.9	(8)	(10)	(5)	(7)	(9)	39
	///	///	///	///	/// /	
7-7.9	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(6)	18
		/		/		
8-8.9	(0)	(1)	(0)	(1)	(0)	2

185

APPENDIX B3

SCORE DISTRIBUTION--ALL VALUES (FRIENDSHIP STRUCTURE)

Scores	Total	Female-Female	Female-Male	Male-Male	Male-Female	
2-2.9	(0)	/	/		/	3
3.-3.9	### /// (8)	### ### // (12)	### ### (10)	### /// (9)	### / (6)	*45
4-4.9	### ### (10)	//// (4)	### / (6)	### /// (8)	### /// (9)	37
5-5.9	### // (7)	### (5)	### // (7)	### /// (8)	### / (6)	33
6-6.9	### //// (9)	### //// (9)	### /// (8)	### //// (9)	### /// (8)	*43
7-7.9	/// (3)	### (5)	### (5)	// (2)	/// // (7)	22
8-8.9	(0)	/	(0)	/		2

185

APPENDIX B4

SCORE DISTRIBUTION--ALL VALUES (BEST FRIEND)

Score	Total	Female-Female	Female-Male	Male-Male	Male-Female	
2-2.9	/	/	### /	//	/	11
3-3.9	### ### //	### ###	### ###	### ////	### /	47
4-4.9	////	### /	(0)	### /	### ////	25
5-5.9	###	###	### /	### //	////	27
6-6.9	### ////	### //	### //	### ///	### //	38
7-7.9	###	###	### /	////	### //	27
8-8.9	/	///	//	/	///	10

185

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Brown, Francis J. Educational Sociology. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1947.
- Cunard, Nandy. Negro Anthology. London: Wishart and Co., 1934.
- Herskovits, Melville J. Dahomey. New York: J. J. Augustin, 1938.
- Johnson, Charles S. Growing Up in the Black Belt. Washington: American Council on Education, 1941.
- Jones, Howard Mumford and Leisy, Ernest E. Major American Writers. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1944.
- Mead, George H. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Mead, Margaret. From the South Seas. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1939.
- Spykman, Nicholas J. Social Theory of Georg Simmel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- Sutherland, Robert L. Color, Class and Personality. Washington: American Council on Education, 1942.
- Thomas, W. I. and Znaniecki, F. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. New York: Knopf, 1927.
- Tonnies, Ferdinand. Fundamental Concepts of Sociology. Translated by Charles P. Loomis. New York: American Book Co., 1940.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, Social Life of a Modern Community, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.
- Warner, W. Lloyd. et. al., Color and Human Nature. Washington: American Council on Education, 1941.

Periodicals

- Abel, Theodore. "The Significance of the Concept of Consciousness of Kind." Social Forces, IX (October, 1930), 1-10.
- Burgess, Ernest W. and Wallin, Paul. "Homogamy in Social Characteristics," The American Journal of Sociology, XLIX (September, 1943), 109-124.

- Frankel, Esther B. and Potaskin, Reva. "A Survey of Sociometric and Pre-Sociometric Literature on Friendship and Social Acceptance Among Children," Sociometry, VII (November, 1944), 422-29.
- Jenkins, Gladys Gardner. "Factors Involved in Children's Friendships," The Journal of Educational Psychology, XXII (September, 1931), 440-48.
- Lutes, Della L. "Losing Friends and Being Influenced," Forum, XCVIII (November, 1937), 262-66.
- Neugarten, Bernice L. "Social Class and Friendship Among School Children," The American Journal of Sociology, LI (January, 1946), 305-313.
- Simmel, Georg. "The Number of Members as Determining the Sociological Form of the Group," Part II. The American Journal of Sociology, VIII (July, 1902), 158-196.
- Smith, Mapheus. "Some Factors in Friendship Selection of High School Students," Sociometry, VII (August, 1944), 303-312.
- Williams, Paul E. "A Study of Adolescent Friendships," Pedagogical Seminary, XXX (December, 1923), 342-346.